

### REMARKS

By the present invention, claims 26, 28-37, 39, 41, 42, 44, 46-55, 57, 59, 60, 62, 64-66, 68-73 and 77-87 have been amended, claims 25, 43 and 61 have been canceled, and claims 88-97 have been newly added. Claims 26, 28-37, 39, 41, 42, 44, 46-55, 57, 59, 60, 62, 64-66, 68-73, 77-97 remain pending in the present application. Claims 88-90 are independent claims.

Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments to the claims are fully supported by the original disclosure, and to the best of the knowledge of the undersigned, introduce no new matter therewith. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

#### ***Claim Objections***

On page 3 of the Office Action, claims 25, 26, 28-37, 39, 41-44, 46-55, 57, 59-62, 64-73, 75, 77 and 78 are objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75 (c) as being of improper dependent form for allegedly failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim.

Applicant has amended claims 25, 26, 29, 30, 32-36, 41-44, 51, 54, 59-62, 65, 66, 68-70, 72, 77 and 78 to overcome this objection, and respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection of claims 25, 26, 28-37, 39, 41-44, 46-55, 57, 59-62, 64-73, 75, 77 and 78 under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75 (c) as being of improper dependent form.

#### ***Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph***

On pages 3 and 4 of the Office Action, claims 25, 26, 28-37, 39, 41-44, 46-55, 57, 59-62, 64-73, 75, 77 and 78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Applicants have amended Claims 25, 26, 29, 30, 32-36, 41-44, 51, 54, 59-62, 65, 66, 68-70, 72, 77 and 78 such that Claims 25, 26, 28-37, 39, 41-44, 46-55, 57, 59-62, 64-73, 75, 77 and 78 fully comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 25, 26, 28-37, 39, 41-44, 46-55, 57, 59-62, 64-73, 75, 77 and 78 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

***Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Ivanov, Leone and Bly***

On pages 5-14 of the Office Action, claims 25, 26, 28-37, 39, 41-44, 46-55, 57, 59-62, 64-73, 75, 77 and 78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Ivanov in view of Leone and Bly. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Newly added claims 88-90 respectively recite a computer-implemented method, a computer program product, and/or system for managing and reviewing content, and making decisions regarding the content. The computer-implemented method, computer program product, and/or system provide a submission module, an administrative module, a chair module, a review module, and a planning module.

According to an exemplary embodiment of the invention, the chair module invites the chairperson to invite reviewers to review all aspects of the submission. The review module provides all aspects of the submission to the reviewer for review. Additionally, the chair module allows the chairperson to change a list of potential reviewers stored in a database. The chairperson may select and invite reviewers from the list of potential reviewers stored in the database to review a particular submission. An identity of an author may be shielded from the reviewers. Additionally, the identity of the reviewers may be shielded from the authors. These novel features provide many advantages over the cited art, as is discussed in more detail below.

Applicant respectfully submits that for at least the following reasons, the combined teachings of Ivanov, Leone and Bly do not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness to reject claims 88-90.

The combination of Ivanov, Leone and Bly fail to teach or reasonably suggest providing a submission module, an administrative module, a chair module, a review module, and a production module.

Additionally, the combination of Ivanov, Leone and Bly fail to teach or reasonably suggest inviting reviewers to review all aspects of submissions. Ivanov only allows each reviewer to review certain aspects of a document (see col. 8, lines 20-24). In Ivanov, each reviewer assumes a role 48 when evaluating each document 44. Each role relates to a well define aspect of the document 44. Document 44 is evaluated in stages. Only after the aspects corresponding to a stage have been

reviewed, can the review of the next stage take place, please see column 8, lines 46-48 of Ivanov. Thus, Ivanov describes a serial method of review where a reviewer is only provided that aspect of the document that relates to their role.

In comparison, each of the independent claims now recite that all aspects of the submission are available to the reviewers. Accordingly, each of the reviewers may access all the text and graphics of a submission. This is the exact opposite of the teaching of Ivanov, in which only well defined aspects of the document are provided to the reviewer.

Each of the independent claims also recites that a common score sheet that is specific to a particular meeting or journal is provided to the reviewers. A common score sheet is used to grade the submission.

In contrast, Ivanov assumes that each reviewer has a role, which is the aspect of the document the reviewer is to review. The reviewers are provided different score sheets for there different roles. Please see column 29, line 65 – column 30, line 8.

Additionally, new dependent claims 92-96 recite that multiple reviewers are able to review all aspects of the submission simultaneously. Again, this is the exact opposite of the teaching of Ivanov. Ivanov requires that document 44 be evaluate in stages. Please see Ivanov, column 8, lines 46-64 and column 10, lines 10-35. Only after one stage has been completed, can the review of next stage take place. Leone and Bly fail to supplement the deficiency of Ivanov because Leone and Bly fail to teach or reasonably suggest inviting reviewers to review all aspects of documents.

Furthermore, dependent claims 30, 48, 66 recite that a chairperson is able to add, delete, change or select reviewers from the list of potential reviewers stored in the database. Ivanov states at column 6, lines 17-19 that the reviewer list can be computed using a programming language just before notifications are sent out. The cited portion of Ivanov does not teach or suggest that a chair module enables a chairperson to add, delete, change or select reviewer from the list of potential reviewer stored in the database. Leone and Bly fail to supplement the deficiency of Ivanov because Leone and Bly fail to teach or reasonable suggest enabling the chairperson to add, delete, change and select reviewers from a list of potential reviewers stored in a database.

Dependent claims 91, 93 and 95 recite additional patentable features. These claims relate to enabling receipt of a submission in a plurality of different formats. The Office Action relies on

Leone for teaching translating documents from one format into another format. Leone only translates a document into HTML format. Leone makes no mention of the ability to receive documents in a plurality of different formats. Bly nowhere teaches or reasonable suggest the ability to receive documents in a plurality of different formats.

Dependent claims 31, 49 and 67 recite that a computer system automatically produces a list of reviewers from the database. The list of reviewers from the database may then be presented to the chairperson to enable the chairperson to make selections of reviewers therefrom. None of the cited referenced fairly teach or suggest these feature.

As such, for at least these reasons, the Office has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Accordingly, claims 88-90 are allowable over Ivanov, Leone and Bly.

Claims 26, 28-37, 39, 41, 42, 44, 46-55, 57, 59, 60, 62, 64-73, 75, 77, 78 and 91-97 are allowable as being dependent from an allowable claim.

### ***Conclusion***

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is hereby invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fee necessitated by this Amendment to our Deposit Account No. 22-0261.


Application No. 09/501,169  
Amendment dated July 25, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of January 25, 2006

Docket No.: 35672-164254

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: July 25, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Jeffri A. Kaminski

Registration No.: 42,709

James R. Burdett

Registration No.: 31,594

VENABLE LLP

P.O. Box 34385

Washington, DC 20043-9998

(202) 344-4000

(202) 344-8300 (Fax)

Attorney/Agent For Applicant